THE MYSORE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY, OF 1906.

GENERAL SUBJECTS.

LEGISLATION.

(Nos. 1—25.)

SUBJECT No. 1.

Converts' Disabilities Removal Regulation.

Summary of discussion.—Mr. C. Srinivasa Rao said that there was no necessity for such a Regulation, and that neither the Government nor the public had any statistics as to the number of conversions from Hinduism and Mahomedanism to Christianity or from Hinduism to Mahomedanism. He pointed out that a population of only 30,000 out of 5½ millions would profit by this new Regulation. If this Regulation were passed, it would give great facilities for the missionaries to convert ignorant people to Christianity. As it is, they are being allowed to work quietly, although they spread all sorts of mischievous pamphlets about Hinduism. If this Regulation were passed, the ignorant masses would misunderstand its objects, and their passions would be roused.

Mr. C. Subba Rao observed that the man who leaves one religion for another in the hope of getting salvation should not care about property. He also said that Roman Catholics were against this Regulation. (It was pointed out to him that it was not so.) This Regulation, if passed, would subvert the principles of Hindu Law, under which inheritance is by birth and the law of survivorship. If a Hindu has two sons, one an ascetic and another a convert to Christianity, the whole of his property would, under the new Regulation, go to the convert son to the exclusion of the son who remains a Hindu ascetic.

Mr. Balakrishna Rao submitted that social and religious laws were intertwined, and that interference with social laws would mean interference with religious laws. A law should be for the greatest benefit of the greatest number. Since 1872 there had been only two cases in which any hardship under the existing law was brought to notice. Society is composed of so many units. If one is strengthened at the expense of the other, it would mean weakness to the whole body.

Mr. Ramanna said that under the Hindu Law the right to inherit was dependent on the obligation to perform funeral ceremonies. If a man refused to perform his part of the implied contract, he could not claim the inheritance. Such a law would be directly opposed to the Queen's Proclamation of 1858.

Mr. Raghavachar pointed out that the British Indian Act of 1850 was passed under the East India Company and before the Queen's Proclamation of 1858 and without ascertaining public opinion. He also referred to the principle of Hindu Law under which the right to inherit went with the right to offer *pindas* to the manes of the ancestors. If the new law was passed, a convert son would claim a share in the family idols and images, and perhaps be eating meat and doing other objectionable things in one part of the house while in another the other members were engaged in religious worship.

Mr. Venkatakrishnaiya said that in all countries converts were not given what were theoretically called their natural rights, and made reference to the case of Mr. Le Mesurier who was removed from the Government service, and to that of Mrs. Annie Besant to whom the English Courts refused the right of guardianship over her children.

Messrs. Hassan Ali Beg, Turuvekere Naranappa, Hanumanta Rao, Anniah Pandit and Gorur Srinivasa Murti also spoke briefly against the Regulation.

Mr. Ramanna added that Her Highness the late Regent had given her opinion against the measure.

Reply of Government.—All the objections urged will be considered. Objections as to the details of the Draft Regulation need not be pressed, as in several cases they might perhaps be easily met. The main point is that the general sentiment of the Assembly is distinctly against the passing of the proposed measure; and this will be duly noted.

SUBJECT No. 2.

The Mines Regulation.

Summary of discussion.—Mr. H.V. Bhima Rao said that that the new Regulation infringed the fundamental principle a man should be presumed to be innocent till he is proved to be guilty; that the liberty of a large number of people in the whole State was at the mercy of the subordinate Police; and that such a Regulation was not in force in British India. It was also represented that the possession of gold ornaments was rendered illegal; that the extension of the Regulation to unwrought gold would surely cause hardship, etc.

The Dewan explained that the Regulation of 1897 cast the onus of proof on the accused in certain circumstances; that this principle therefore was not an innovation newly